

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERJUN 17 2008
PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23 and 25-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10-13, 17, 20, and 23 are amended, with claims 5 and 24 previously canceled.

No new matter is presented by this Amendment. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in the Abstract, in the previously presented claims, and in paragraphs 0039-0052 and the drawings of the published patent application US 2003/0105981.

Each of the independent claims are amended to further recite features of the invention.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

A. The 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 9-19, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Squier et al. (US 7,188,181). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 9 is directed to a method for validating session credentials of a client. In particular, claim 9 recites:

determining, at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system;

after the determining, retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information being retrieved from the client, the information corresponding to a session credential for the second system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system, ...

Applicant of course appreciates that patentability is based on the claimed invention. However, such claimed features are reflective of Applicant's disclosure in paragraphs 00140-0045 of the published patent application. Therein, the present application discloses:

[0042] At step 204, system 1 (102) determines whether the client has a

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

valid single sign-on (SSO) session.

[0043] If the client has a valid SSO session, then at step 206, the client is granted access to the protected resource(s) of system 1 (102), and the method ends.

[0044] If, at step 204, it is determined that the client does not have a valid SSO session, then at step 208, system 1 (102) retrieves an SSO session token from the client. The token corresponds to a possible SSO session that the client has with another system (104). When the method of the invention is used with a web based application and browser, the token is the same as or similar to a cookie. When the method of the invention is used with systems other than the Internet and web based applications, the token is a piece of data or information that provides authentication or credentials of the client with system 2.

The claims are amended to further recite particulars relating to the determining of whether the client has a valid single sign-on (SSO) session and the subsequent retrieval of a token from the client. Squier fails to teach such processing, so as to teach the claimed invention, as set forth in claim 9.

Instead, for example, Squier teaches (in portions of Squier referenced in the Office Action) at column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 15:

the session identifier created by the origin server is passed or handed to the destination server by the user when the user makes the request on the destination Web site. By examining the session identifier the destination server can determine that the user got the identifier from the origin server from the name and value fields of the cookie handed to the destination server. Those fields will contain the origin Web site's identifier and the session identifier, respectively. As defined in RFC 2109, only servers residing in the domain the specified in the cookie can receive the cookie. As mentioned above, the session identifier uniquely identifies the user and a session. In the described embodiment it contains an identifier containing an indicator of the origin server.

However, such teachings, and the other disclosure of Squier fail to teach the particulars of claim 9 reciting "determining, at the first system that a client does not have a valid session

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

credential granted by the first system" and "after the determining, retrieving, at the first system, information from a session token held by the client, the information being retrieved from the client".

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 9 is allowable for at least these reasons, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested. Applicant further submits that independent claims 10-13, 17 and 23 are allowable for similar reasons, and the claims dependent on these independent claims are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable claims.

B. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection Based on Squier and Howard

Claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squier et al. in view of Howard et al. (US 6,584,505).

The Office Action asserts various teachings of Squier. However, the Office Action acknowledges, as to the rejected claims, that Squier fails to teach features relating to the directing of the client (see Office Action on page 6, lines 21-23). The Office Action then proposes to modify Squier with the teachings of Howard so as to cure such deficiencies.

Applicant submits that even if it were obvious to so modify Squier, which Applicant does not admit, such modifications would fail to cure the deficiencies as discussed above. That is, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 20 are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Squier and Howard, as set forth in the Office Action, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 17 2008
PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is requested.

C. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection Based on Squier and Marks

In the Office Action, claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squier et al. and further in view of Marks et al. (US 20010054059).

The Office Action asserts various teachings of Squier. However, the Office Action acknowledges, as to the rejected claims, that Squier fails to teach features relating to the pay-per-use and the subscription content (see Office Action on page 8, lines 18-22). The Office Action proposes to modify Squier with the teachings of Marks so as to cure such deficiencies.

Applicant submits that even if it were obvious to so modify Squier, which Applicant does not admit, such modifications would fail to cure the deficiencies as discussed above as to the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Squier and Marks, as set forth in the Office Action, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is requested.

D. CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
HUNTON & WILLIAMS



James R. Miner
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500

Dated: June 17, 2008

JRM/PTO010408/SD51508